

February 7, 2006

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 7, 2006**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on February 7, 2006 at 6:05 p.m. by Chairman Thompson in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Kosla, Merz, Murphy, Smith, Chrm. Thompson

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Will Wong, Community Development Director;
Reg Murray, Senior Planner;
Bryan Jones, Associate Civil Engineer;
Sue Fraizer, Administrative Assistant

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM III: ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS

Mark C. Smith volunteered to be the alternate for Traffic Committee.

ITEM IV: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 17, 2006 were approved as submitted.

ITEM V: PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

February 7, 2006

ITEM VI:

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. Tentative Subdivision Map and Tree Permit – 406 Maidu Drive (Canyon Creek Subdivision) – Files SUB 03-2, TP 03-2.

The applicant requests approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map and Tree Permit for the Canyon Creek subdivision located at 406 Maidu Drive. The request includes a tentative subdivision map to subdivide an 11-acre parcel into twenty-four (24) single-family residential lots as well as a Tree Permit to allow the removal of ± 359 native trees.

Planner Murray gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval of a tentative subdivision map and tree permit for 406 Maidu Drive. One distinction of this Staff Report is the use of a Resolution (Exhibit A) which includes the conditions of approval. By recommendation of the City Attorney, henceforth all of the conditions will be put into Resolution form. Staff recommends approval of this request, as well as approval of the additional wording on Condition 54, the addition of Condition 6 (h), and the addition of Condition 8 to immediately follow Condition 7 and be prior to the Public Works Conditions.

Comm. Merz asked what the correct amount of impacted trees for this project is.

Planner Murray stated that the number is 150 for the road, and potentially 215 impacted for the remainder of the project.

Comm. Merz asked if there are any federal requirements for a NEPA Environmental Impact report.

Planner Murray stated that the applicant may need to go through the NEPA process which is a separate process.

Comm. Merz asked how it is decided which impact review will be done.

Planner Murray said that first an application is completed by the developer, that is then reviewed, and in this case, an environmental consultant, North Fork Development was used to review the document. Staff then determined that an initial study with a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Mitigation Monitoring Report were needed.

Comm. Merz asked who pays the consultant.

February 7, 2006

Planner Murray explained that the consultant prepared the document on the City's behalf. The applicant pays the City, and the City pays the consultant.

Comm. Murphy asked questions about the process, which Planner Murray answered.

Comm. Murphy asked when the Commission can add or remove conditions.

Planner Murray stated that this meeting is their chance to do that.

Comm. Murphy asked if the applicant does not want to comply with the conditions, what their choices are.

Planner Murray stated that if the applicant or the public is dissatisfied with the way in which the project is approved or disapproved they can appeal the decision to the City Council and the same review process would be done by the City Council.

There was discussion about the application and review process.

Comm. Kosla asked about the tree permit process and if it can be done per lot.

The tree permit process was discussed.

Comm. Kosla asked if separated sidewalks will be used in the subdivision.

Planner Murray said standard sidewalks will be used.

There was discussion about separated sidewalks versus standard sidewalks.

Comm. Murphy asked if a condition can be added to require separated sidewalks.

Planner Murray stated that in this type of project the applicant would not be required to provide separated sidewalks.

Comm. Kosla asked if individual tree permits will be obtained.

Planner Murray explained the tree permit process.

Comm. Merz asked what the Mitigated Fund is used for.

February 7, 2006

Planner Murray gave examples of uses of the funds.

Comm. Merz expressed his concern about the impact to animals and whether that has been sufficiently addressed.

Comm. Murphy asked about the meaning of the dotted line (perimeter) on the map.

Planner Murray said that the dotted line is to provide a basis of understanding for tree impact on the residential lots.

Comm. Murphy asked for clarification about the maps with regard to setbacks, which Planner Murray provided.

Comm. Murphy feels that the front, side and rear setback should be shown on the map.

There was discussion between Comm. Murphy and Planner Murray regarding requirements for plan submittals.

The applicant, Marcus Loduca, introduced himself. His clients, the Sheahans, are the owners of the property. They are willing to work with the surrounding neighbors. They are in agreement with the 113 conditions listed for the tentative map, and 27 conditions listed for the tree permit. He is asking for approval of this project as proposed.

Comm. Murphy asked if the applicant knows how much the tree mitigation fee will be.

Planner Murray stated that the estimated amount is \$33,000.00 for the 150 trees affected by the subdivision improvements. Additional tree mitigation cost will be determined for construction on each individual lot.

Chrm. Thompson asked who pays for the Mitigation fees.

Planner Murray said that the developer would be responsible for the fees for subdivision improvements. The homebuilder will be responsible for each of the individual lots.

Chrm. Thompson asked for those to speak who are in favor of the project.

February 7, 2006

Bill Mitchell, project engineer spoke. He worked closely with staff on this project. On the map, the building envelopes shown on the lots are larger than the actual houses that will be constructed, so there should be more room on each lot than is shown. They tried to avoid the loss of the major trees on the property.

Comm. Murphy asked if he'd be willing to have his client have a fixed "envelope".

Mr. Mitchell said they looked at the best part of the lot when choosing where to place the homes.

Comm. Murphy asked if they considered saving some trees by using a retaining wall.

Mr. Mitchell said he hasn't found retaining walls to be a good alternative.

Comm. Murphy asked if he would support some restrictions which would address the proper care of oak trees.

Mr. Mitchell said he'd be willing to put some pamphlets together and give them to potential buyers. There is a nice booklet entitled "How to Live Among the Oaks" which they use.

Planner Murray indicated that it is already a condition that the applicant provide that kind of notification to prospective homebuyers.

Comm. Kosla asked some questions about the process of selling the tentative map, and who is responsible to abide by the conditions.

Planner Murray said that the tentative map can be sold to a homebuilder, and the conditions must be adhered to by the owner of the property.

Comm. Kosla asked if there is anything preventing the homebuilder from taking out as many trees as he wants.

Planner Murray stated that the City would prevent that by the issuance of the Tree Permit, as the conditions that already exist still must be adhered to. Through the improvement plan process, the trees in the roadway will be removed, but those in the margins will be left until the construction process is over, to see how they respond through that process.

February 7, 2006

Chrm. Thompson asked for those to speak who are opposed to the project.

Rod Gross, who lives on Vista del Lago spoke. He has submitted written comments about the project. He is concerned that the recreational aspect has not been thoroughly explored, specifically with regard to the closure of the Western States Pioneer Express Trail.

Planner Murray stated that the only time the trail will be closed or re-directed is during paving.

Mr. Gross asked how the word will get out about the closure or re-direction.

Planner Murray stated that there is an alternative for the trail location during paving written up which will be distributed to the Commissioners. This will allow for no disruption in access to the trail.

Engineer Bryan Jones stated that the developer, the Bureau of Reclamation and the State Parks supervisor met at the site in January and decided that the alternative route is the best location for the trail.

Comm. Merz asked if there is a CEQA requirement for this.

Engineer Jones said the Bureau of Reclamation or State Parks will be handling that.

Mr. Gross said that he feels that a condition needs to be made for this so that it takes place as it should.

Planner Murray said that Condition #4 addresses this issue.

Daniel Armstrong of Land Development Services spoke. He met with the State Parks & Recreation representative, Auburn Recreation District, and the Bureau of Reclamation. The conclusion was that Mr. Armstrong would modify his design for the trail. The CEQA and NEPA process will have to be done. The time frame is 2 to 3 months.

George Coes, a neighbor of the project spoke about his concerns regarding fog at the site. He would like to see a condition that addresses this in some way for the safety of the community.

February 7, 2006

Tom Bowen, also a neighbor of the project is concerned about safety at the road coming into Vista del Lago. He wrote a letter to the Commission regarding this and he suggests the use of a cul-de-sac.

Planner Murray said that the design of the subdivision meets all City standards. Through roads are encouraged by the General Plan. Mr. Murray explained the problems that could exist if the street were converted to a cul-de-sac.

Chrm. Thompson asked if an emergency access (gate) could be installed there.

Planner Murray responded that it would inhibit access by the fire department, as well as possibly preventing the occupants from leaving the area.

Comm. Kosla asked if the area would be lit up for better visibility in the fog.

There was discussion about the use of reflective bumps to increase visibility during foggy conditions.

Dr. Ann Lebar who resides on Maidu Dr. spoke about her concerns about how to blend the new homes with the larger homes in one area and the smaller homes in the other area. She is also concerned about the equestrian trail.

Comm. Murphy suggested that he believes the best way to address this problem is by making the side-yards a little greater.

Daniel Armstrong said that making the street into a cul-de-sac would simply transfer the traffic from one street to another street.

Ken Anderson with K.D. Anderson Transportation Engineers responded to the fog issue. Usually a center line luminous stripe works well. The standards here are the same as other cities with fog issues.

Daniel Armstrong stated that the owners have been negotiating with several builders. There was discussion with the other homeowners regarding one story homes versus two stories, but no promises were made. Whoever the builder is will work to obtain homes that work well with the neighborhood.

February 7, 2006

Comm. Kosla asked if the area homeowners were shown any examples of homes in a similar subdivision.

Mr. Armstrong said they had been shown a power point presentation.

Gary Raine, who lives on the ridge above the project requests that the homes be placed to preserve the view from his home. He passed the Commissioners a copy of an e-mail between his wife and Craig Lawson of Pinnacle Builders indicating that they are the builders for the subdivision. Mr. Lawson indicated in the letter that single-story houses would be built on the west side of the lots with the two-story portion on the street side. He asked if they would be notified when individual building permits are obtained.

Planner Murray stated that there is no public notification when a home is built. However, Staff reviews the plans for development standards, setbacks, and tree permits. Staff does not get involved in the architecture.

There was discussion about the size and type of trees that can be allowed.

Comm. Kosla asked what the maximum height of a home can be.

Planner Murray stated that it is 30 feet, measured from height to adjacent grade.

Comm. Kosla stated that potentially all of the homeowners on Riverview could completely lose their view.

Comm. Smith asked if the developer is considering constructing single story homes on the side of the street that is next to Riverview, and two story homes on the other side.

Daniel Armstrong stated that there was discussion of this in the neighborhood meeting. Because of the slope of the properties that would be the most logical design but he is unsure if they could commit to that.

Marcus Loduca stated that the one-story homes create issues with setbacks and the homes may seem too close together. They could not agree to that at this time.

February 7, 2006

Comm. Kosla asked Mr. Loduca if they'd be willing to work out some special conditions for the other lots, as they did for lots 19, 20 & 21.

Mr. Loduca said that if they do that for one, then others want the same, and it wouldn't be feasible.

Peggy Egli who lives on Riverview Dr. is concerned about construction traffic and the safety of the residents.

Helena Raine, who lives on Riverview, stated that she understood when she attended the neighborhood meeting that Pinnacle Homes was going to be the builder.

Mr. Loduca stated that Pinnacle is a potential builder, and the owners are considering other builders as well.

Chrm. Thompson asked why Pinnacle sent the letter out.

Mr. Loduca said that Pinnacle was proposing to be the builder, and wanted to take an active role.

Daniel Tebbs who lives on Riverview Dr. stated that he currently has a great view. His concerns are the fence and the traffic in general. He feels that they also were misled to believe that Pinnacle had been chosen as the homebuilder.

There was discussion about the fencing and who would pay for a new fence to be built.

Mr. Armstrong said there would be no cost to the adjacent owner for the new fence.

Helena Raine asked how the current homeowners will be notified when issues such as fences come up so that they can work together to obtain an agreement for how the fences will be built.

Comm. Murray stated that this would be incumbent upon the developer.

Mr. Armstrong stated that at the time of the plot plan and prior to approval would be the time that things such as fences will be worked out with the adjacent homeowners.

Comm. Merz asked if the developer does, in fact have a builder chosen.

February 7, 2006

Mr. Loduca said the Sheahans are talking to other builders and have not made an agreement with anyone yet.

Peggy Egli stated that she is surprised by that because at the neighborhood meeting they were all left with the impression that Pinnacle had been chosen.

Lynn Wingate who lives in Riverview Dr. asked who monitors the construction guidelines that are set forth in the mitigated report.

Engineer Jones stated that the Environmental Document addresses the agencies that have responsibility for that.

Comm. Murphy asked Mr. Loduca if the developers would be willing to meander the road a little more, if they'd be willing to gather rocks and use them as elements in retaining walls or site elements, protect some trees on each property with more space in the side yards, and restrict the 2nd floor to 2/3 the size of the footprint of the downstairs.

Mr. Armstrong said that a comprehensive analysis was done by an arborist. That document is a part of the environmental document.

Bill Mitchell stated that there are several reasons for the proposed alignment of the road and if more bends are put in the road you can lose your sight distance and you lose design speed. Both ends of the road are fixed.

Comm. Murphy asked Planner Murray how it could be worked out to avoid removal of some of the trees.

Planner Murray explained the process.

Comm. Murphy asked about saving some of the existing rocks and using them as a site element.

Mr. Loduca said they would be willing to do that. He said they would not be able to agree to a non two-story requirement.

Public comment was closed.

There was discussion about separated sidewalks. Director Wong stated that the latest proposal that will be considered by the City Council would not require separated sidewalks in an interior subdivision.

February 7, 2006

Comm. Kosla asked if the City has a requirement regarding the time between infrastructure and build-out.

Planner Murray said no, the tentative map is good for 2 years with the possibility of three one-year extensions.

Director Wong stated that he's never seen a developer delay construction.

Comm. Kosla asked what the fire fee is.

Director Wong replied that there is no fire fee, there are facilities impact fees that go to Public Works, Fire Dept. and Police Dept. to buy equipment, and there is property tax.

Comm. Smith stated that he'd like to add a condition to direct all heavy equipment traffic via Maidu Drive from Auburn Folsom Rd. during the duration of the project.

Planner Murray responded that Staff would not encourage adding that condition, and explained why. However, a condition could be added to encourage that route for traffic.

Comm. Wong explained that as these conditions are added, Staff has to think about how to enforce the conditions.

Planner Murray created a condition to address this which would encourage the use of a certain route by using signage.

Chrm. Thompson mentioned several conditions that she would like to see added.

Planner Murray noted these requests and responded with the conditions that would apply.

Comm. Murphy requested conditions for a meandering road, and several particular trees that he would like to see saved, as it is possible, and the use of existing rock and increased setbacks.

There was discussion about the setbacks for the side and rear yards, line delineators, and other conditions to be added.

Michael Murphy **MOVED** to:

- A. Adopt the following findings of fact for the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Canyon

February 7, 2006

Creek Subdivision (SCH2006012016):

1. The Planning Commission, on the basis of the whole record before it (including the initial study and any comments received) finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.
2. The Planning Commission has determined that the Mitigated Negative Declaration includes a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP). All of the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration have been incorporated in the MMRP and these measures have been agreed to by the applicant and are fully enforceable through CEQA and applicable City Ordinances.
3. All documents and materials relating to the proceedings for the Canyon Creek Subdivision are maintained in the City of Auburn Community Development Department; 1225 Lincoln Way, Room 3; Auburn, CA 95603.

Comm. Kosla **SECONDED**.

AYES:	Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

- B. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the Canyon Creek Tentative Subdivision Map.

Comm. Kosla **SECONDED**.

AYES:	Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

The motion was approved.

February 7, 2006

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

C. Adopt the following findings of fact for the Canyon Creek Tentative Subdivision Map (File SUB 03-2):

1. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the Auburn General Plan.
2. The design or improvement of the proposed Subdivision is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the Auburn General Plan.
3. The site is physically suitable for the proposed development.
4. The site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development.
5. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.
6. The design of the subdivision or improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems.
7. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision.

Chrm. Thompson **SECONDED.**

AYES:	Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

D. Approve the Canyon Creek Tentative Subdivision Map (File SUB 03-2) subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A, Condition 54 which is amended to read; Lots 1-10 shall shall pump up to the gravity line on Canyon Creek if required, based upon topography.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED.**

February 7, 2006

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

- D. Approve the Canyon Creek Tentative Subdivision Map (File SUB 03-2) subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A, with the addition of Condition 6(h) which reads: Homes shall be constructed utilizing stem wall construction methods.

Chrm. Thompson **SECONDED**.

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

- D. Approve the Canyon Creek Tentative Subdivision Map (File SUB 03-2) subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A, with the addition of Condition 8 which reads: The City has determined that City, its employees, agents and officials should, to the fullest extent permitted by law, be fully protected from any loss, injury, damage, claim, lawsuit, expense, attorneys fees, litigation expenses, court costs or any other costs arising out of or in any way related to the issuance of this [permit]. Accordingly, to the fullest extent permitted by law, [Applicant] shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless City, its employees, agents and officials, from and against any liability, claims, suits, actions, arbitration proceedings, regulatory proceedings, losses, expenses or costs of any kind, whether actual, alleged or threatened, including, but not limited to, actual attorneys fees, litigation expenses and court costs of any kind without restriction or limitation, incurred in relation to, as a consequence of, arising out of or in any way attributable to, actually, allegedly or impliedly, in whole or in part the issuance of this [permit], or the activities

February 7, 2006

conducted pursuant to this [permit]. Applicant shall pay such obligations as they are incurred by City, its employees, agents and officials, and in the event of any claim or lawsuit, shall submit a deposit in such amount as the City reasonably determines necessary to protect the City from exposure to fees, costs or liability with respect to such claim or lawsuit.

Chrm. Thompson **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

Add Condition 65: Access to the existing Bureau of Reclamation sewer lift station shall be amended to include the realigned gravel trail as detailed with amended Sht C6 presented to the Planning Commission on February 7, 2006.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

Add Condition 37: The developer shall work with the Public Works Department for the provision of lane Delineators and/or striping on Canyon Creek Drive and adjacent streets (Vista Del Lago, Maidu, and Riverview).

Chrm. Thompson **SECONDED.**

February 7, 2006

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Merz **MOVED** to:

Amend Condition 5 to include the following: The fence shall be constructed utilizing steel posts; rock treatments shall be used on the pilasters. The developer shall work with adjacent property owners on the construction of the fence as a “good neighbor” fence. (CDD)

Comm. Kosla **SECONDED**.

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

Add Condition 6(a)(i) to read: The minimum interior side yard setback shall be 10’.

Chrm. Thompson **SECONDED**.

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

Add Condition 38: The developer shall work to protect native rocks during construction of the subdivision improvements. Native rocks disturbed during

February 7, 2006

construction shall be stockpiled for incorporation into the subdivision design.

Comm. Kosla **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

Add Condition 6(a)(ii): Lots 11-18 shall have a minimum rear yard setback of 35'.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Kosla **MOVED** to:

Add Condition 24: Construction traffic is encouraged to utilize Maidu Drive during the construction of subdivision improvements.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Chrm. Thompson **MOVED** to:

Add Condition 66: The applicant shall install signs and striping to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department to designate access to the Western States

February 7, 2006

Pioneer Express Trail near the Bureau of Reclamation sewer lift station. Notification shall be added on Maidu Drive near the entry to the station and at the bottom of the paved access road.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Murphy **MOVED** to:

Add Condition 39: The developer shall work with the Community Development and Public Works Departments to meander Canyon Creek Drive to preserve native trees. The road shall meander $\pm 12'$ to the east to save trees 25, 26, 27, and 33, $\pm 18'$ to the west to preserve trees 427 and 450, and $\pm 12'$ to the east to save trees 65, 377, and 325. Retaining walls are encouraged to be used as part of the project design in order to preserve trees.

Director Wong pointed out that this condition is subject to the review and approval of the Public Works and Community Development Departments. We will review the arborist's report first, then make a determination about what trees can be saved. It must meet engineering and planning standards. This item will not come back before the Planning Commission.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Chrm. Thompson **MOVED** to:

D. Approve the Canyon Creek Tentative Subdivision Map (File SUB 03-2) subject to the conditions

February 7, 2006

listed in Exhibit A, as modified by the above conditions.

Comm. Murphy **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Chrm. Thompson **MOVED** to:

- E. Adopt the following findings of fact for the Tree Permit (File TP 03-2):
1. The tree permit will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare;
 2. The tree permit is consistent with the provisions of the Tree Ordinance; and
 3. Measures have been incorporated in the project or the permit to mitigate impacts to remaining trees or to provide replacement for trees removed.

Comm. Kosla **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Chrm. Thompson **MOVED** to:

- F. Approve the Tree Permit (File TP 03-2) for the Canyon Creek Tentative Subdivision Map subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A.

Comm. Murphy **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

February 7, 2006

The motion was approved.

Chrm. Thompson **MOVED** to:

G. Adopt the Planning Commission Resolution 06-1.

Comm. Kosla **SECONDED**.

AYES:	Merz, Murphy, Smith, Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

ITEM VII. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

- A. No Report
- B. There will be a Planning Commission Meeting on February 21, 2006. There will be a training for Planning Commissioners with the city attorney on Monday, March 6, 2006 from 6:30-9:00 p.m.
- C. No Report

ITEM VIII: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

- 1. Comm. Merz informed Comm. Smith that the Traffic Committee Meeting time is 8:30 a.m. on the 1st and 3rd Tuesday of each month. The next meeting will be on February 21, 2006.
- 2. Chrm. Thompson asked about speakers outside the Council Chambers. Director Wong responded that staff is working on this.
- 3. Comm. Murphy asked for a chalk board to be installed on the wall in Council Chambers. Director Wong stated that he will work on getting one installed.

ITEM IX: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

None.

February 7, 2006

ITEM X.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Fraizer, Administrative Assistant

.

Planning Commission

February 7, 2006

Planning Commission

February 7, 2006